UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Emma Goldman - - *Curtis W. Reese*

Should America Enter Into the War? -
- *An Interview with Royal Wilbur France*

Toward a Pacifist Philosophy - *Wendell Thomas*

Propaganda in News Reports About Finland
- - - - - - - *Ben Segal*

VOLUME CXXV NUMBER 7

Chicago, June 3, 1940

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY, Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Publication Committee

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, Chairman
MRS E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-Chairman
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MR. JAMES E. TUCKER

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Washington Correspondent

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Notes 99

Jottings—J. H. H. 102

ARTICLES—

Emma Goldman—CURTIS W. REESE 102

Should America Enter Into the War?—An Interview with ROYAL WILBUR FRANCE 103

Toward a Pacifist Philosophy—WENDELL THOMAS 107

Propaganda in News Reports About Finland—BEN SEGAL 108

On the Pacifist Front—XV 110

POETRY—

Sound—GRACE KIESS SWIGGETT 101

THE FIELD—

Bertrand Russell—The American Theological Society 98

Collective-Cooperative Farming Conference in Mexico 98

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Bertrand Russell

The American Theological Society (Mid-West Branch), at its spring meeting, April 15, passed the following resolution concerning the Bertrand Russell case and ordered that copies be sent to the American Civil Liberties Union, to Mayor La Guardia, and given to the press:

Without desiring to express any approval either of the personal ideas or mode of life of Bertrand Russell, we desire to go on record as being deeply concerned over the threat to academic freedom involved in (1) the judicial injunction restraining the New York Board of Higher Education from appointing Mr. Bertrand Russell to a teaching post in the College of the City of New York, and (2) in the action of the city administration in striking the salary item for said post from the budget, thus effectively disposing of the case.

The American Theological Society,

President, Professor C. S. Braden of Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois.

Vice-President, Professor R. W. Frank of the Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Chicago, Illinois.

Secretary-Treasurer, Professor James L. Adams of The Meadville Theological School, Chicago, Illinois.

Executive Committee, Dr. Harold L. Bowman, First Presbyterian Church, Chicago, Illinois.

Professor Paul L. Lehman, Elmhurst College, Elmhurst, Illinois.

Collective-Cooperative Farming Conference in Mexico

An opportunity to study Mexico's chief problem—the distribution and working of the land—at first hand in the most vivid laboratory of social change in the New World will be afforded at the Second Annual Conference on Collective-Cooperative Farming in the Laguna Region, to be held in Torreon, Coahuila, Mexico, July 4-7, 1940. Sessions will be held in the hall of the Union de Trabajadores del Banco Ejidal, Falcon Sur 218, from 5 to 8 p. m. each afternoon. Speeches will be in English, and mimeographed copies will be distributed to the Conference members. Questions and answers will follow each speech.

Another conference with the same program will be held August 3-5, 1940, for those who cannot attend the one in July.

For further information, address Clarence Senior, Director, La Laguna Conference, Avda. Chapultepec 512, Mexico, D. F.

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXV MONDAY, June 3, 1940 No. 7

THE RIGHTEOUS NATION

Methought I saw a nation arise in the world, and the strength thereof was the strength of right. Her bulwarks were noble spirits and ready arms; her war was in the cause of all mankind. Her captains were men of noble skill in all manner of work, and of high thought for the good of brethren under every star. Every man rejoiced in his garden, and in the kindly fruits of the earth. The harvest of the mind was esteemed a higher care than the harvest of the earth; the getting of riches was less than the spending of instruction. Every child was trained in the beauty of a clear spirit and an open mind, in the use of reason rightly, living for the ideal good. To the supreme good all the people were devoted.

—Rollo Russell

ARMAGEDDON

The editorial office of UNITY is too far removed from the publication office to make possible any comment marching *pari passu* with world events. But even though we were sitting at this moment right side of the waiting presses, we would hesitate to interpret so frightful and confused a scene as that of Europe today. Yet certain things seem clear! First, war is as bad as we have always said it was. Nay, it is worse—worse not only in destructive potency but also in sheer barbaric horror. Massacre, falsehood, lust, lies, and death—these are the weapons with which we are invited to save the world. Let who will believe that, in such a struggle as this, the world can thus be saved. We did not believe it yesterday, and still less do we believe it today as Europe is turned into one vast holocaust of ruin. Secondly, this is the end of the world that we have known—our modern world. As Greece, Rome, feudalism were all swept away, so now our nationalistic and capitalistic civilization is being shattered into bits. It makes little difference now who wins the war. Everything which to us is familiar and precious, all comfort, ease and safety, our ways of life and laws of custom, our standards of thought and visions of happy days—these now are doomed. This does not mean that mankind is lost. It simply means that we have come to one of those vast epochs of human destiny in which, amid indescribable chaos and cataclysm, the old is swept away, and in due time all things are made new. For the generation which is forced to witness and endure such change, there is only misery, despair, and death. Only those unborn will see a world made whole again. Lastly, and more certainly than ever, we believe that America must stay out of this war. Europe is already gone—it cannot be saved. Shall we then add our nation to the total of destruction, and therewith make the horror of our time complete? We owe something, everything, not so much to ourselves as to the future—to preserve in this fair land the substance, the wealth, the blood, the clear thought, honest purpose, and unexhausted vitality, which can alone save mankind itself from death.

THE WORKERS' RESPONSIBILITY

In a recent issue of *War Commentary,* a radical labor monthly published in England, we find a reference to labor's responsibility for and share in this war. Says the editor:

> It is a mistake to assume that the responsibility for the war lies entirely with Hitler, Chamberlain, Daladier, and other politicians. The war is being fought by the workers of Germany, France, Britain, Norway, etc., in the front line trenches, at sea, in the air, and in the factories. And therein lies their responsibility. And this is the tragedy: that workers, the exploited class whether in Britain, France, or Germany, can be successfully deceived by the ruling classes of their respective countries into believing that the workers of other lands are their enemies. * * *
>
> The world is in the process of committing mass suicide. Unless the workers recover their senses, realize their responsibilities as workers towards their brothers in other lands, the war will take its toll in lives and wealth, and those human values, which are the justification of our existence, lost beyond recovery.

We are tempted to lay more emphasis of responsibility upon governments, "politicians," than the editor of *War Commentary* does in the above statements. After all, these governments have enormous power, and if they propose to betray the people into war, what can the people do about it? The people of no nation today want to fight, they simply ask to be left alone, and, if left alone, would live peacefully and happily with their neighbors—Germans and French as friendly as Swedes and Norwegians. But governments will not leave them alone, and governments have the power. How much are the people of this country, for example, being consulted about Europe, and if Mr. Roosevelt, like Mr. Wilson before him, makes up his mind to go into the war, what can we do about it? Refuse to fight? Yes, there is the one weapon in our hands. *Refuse to fight!* Here is where the workers

are so reprehensible, and responsible. There was a time when the workers of the world, in the trades-unions and great international Socialist parties, solemnly pledged themselves not to take up arms against one another. These pledges all collapsed in 1914—and have never been renewed since. English workers slaughter German workers, and vice versa, as blithely as Spaniards slaughtered each other in the civil war. Even Russian workers, chanting "Workers of the World, Unite," slaughter Finnish workers without a qualm. There is no substance to the international workers movement—American labor has not a trace of genuine pacifist, or anti-war, conviction. And it may be well to remember this when we hear liberals and radicals deriding and denouncing the church for not opposing war. There is no more reason in itself why the church should oppose war than labor. And when labor has in its whole body as much pacifist idealism that means business as the church today has in its little finger, then the liberals and radicals can talk.

WHAT BEN FRANKLIN FORESAW

Writing from Paris on January 16, 1784, Benjamin Franklin describes seeing a balloon ascension.

> [This] appears, as you observe, to be a discovery of great importance, and what may possibly give a new turn to human affairs. Convincing sovereigns of the folly of wars may perhaps be one effect of it; since it will be impracticable for the most potent of them to guard his dominions. Five thousand balloons, capable of raising two men each, could not cost more than five ships of the line; and where is the prince who can afford so to cover his country with troops for its defense, as that ten thousand men descending from the clouds might not in many places do an infinite deal of mischief, before a force could be brought together to repel them.

We count this passage one of the most remarkable instances of prescience in history. Today we have not balloons but airplanes and parachutes, as witness Finland, Norway, and Holland. But the principle is the same, and though it took a century and a half, it is now fulfilled. Just what this genius of common-sense foresaw has at last occurred. Yet, wise as he was, Franklin was not able to prophesy accurately the effect of this phenomenon upon war. He innocently surmised that the possibilities of the balloon would convince "sovereigns of the folly of wars." But, as we now know, nothing can convince sovereigns, or prime ministers and presidents, of the folly of wars. One hundred and fifty-six years have passed since Benjamin Franklin wrote these words, and during this period war has attained a potency of madness which not even a demon from hell could have foreseen; yet nations still settle their disputes as blithely by the arbitrament of arms as ever they did in days gone by. In this field of human conduct, the race has not advanced an inch. Indeed, looking at stricken Europe at this hour, we are inclined to affirm that mankind has retrograded to an age of savagery so remote as to be beyond the horizon of recorded history.

CONFIDENCE IN FAILURE

> As the New Deal enters its eighth year the industrial activity index has declined further—though from a much higher level—than it did the year before Mr. Roosevelt took office. Government statisticians indignantly dispute the calculations of those who say unemployment is less than 9 millions. Yet the New Deal to restore recovery has spent 25 billion dollars since 1932, when business activity had less of a decline; the debt limit has been cracked; and there is a prospect that federal spending in the 1941 fiscal year will top any previous year in the New Deal.
>
> The war will have to come much nearer before growing interest in it and a popular foreign policy can be made into a magic skin to cover that record.

This statement is by the distinguished Washington correspondent, Mr. Arthur Krock. It points to what remains one of the never-ceasing marvels of this age—that the New Deal still retains the confidence and even the enthusiastic support of most liberals in this country, in spite of its record of flat failure in the one job for which it was elected and with which it has been concerned for seven long, disastrous years. We know not whether to attribute this phenomenon to Mr. Roosevelt's unconquerable charm or to the liberals' unextinguishable naiveté. Perhaps neither alternative hits the bull's-eye since Mr. Roosevelt is not always charming and liberals are not always naive. A sounder explanation of this clinging to a chief magistrate who has succeeded at vast expense in doing nothing to solve the pressing ills of our political and social economy, is to be found in the courageous spirits, inexhaustible resourcefulness, and progressive intentions of an administration which has at least tried to do something to end our troubles, and on the other hand in the appalling absence of any alternative in either party to the present occupant of the White House. It is true that our debt has been raised to the limit, that our currency has been debauched, that bureaucracy is everywhere rife, that unemployment is as great as ever, the farmers as miserable, business as depressed, the nation as disordered and completely at sea—but, who could have done any better in these disastrous years, and who is likely to do any better in the years ahead? Yet the record of blank and awful failure, amid vast confusion and inexcusable frivolity, remains; and now, as the election draws near, comes the feeling that this record must be covered up. And, of course, the war is the perfect cover! Here is the supreme peril of this hour—the intrusion of a war, which is not our concern, into our domestic affairs which should have us sick with worry. The European tragedy is the grandest political red herring ever. It will be amazing if the administration does not use it.

PROTESTANTS AND THE VATICAN

Within a single week have come smashing retorts to this silly business, indulged in by all too many Protestants, of denouncing the President for seeking contact with the Pope in the interest of peace through his personal representative, Mr. Myron C. Taylor. For all

too long, religious papers and church conferences have been having it their own way in lining up the Protestant forces against the administration on this specious issue of church and state. But now comes Dr. Guy Emery Shipler in his superb paper, the *Churchman,* to call a halt to this stirring up of prejudice as between Protestants and Catholics. And here is Dr. Stanley High hitting out in indignant protest in his stirring address before the Massachusetts Interchurch Convention. It would be "far better for Protestants to keep silent," says Dr. High, if the best they have to offer to "a world with its back to the wall is a resolution against Mr. Roosevelt's appointment of Myron Taylor to the Vatican." Referring to the European crisis, he goes on:

> To meet the engulfing menace will require all the unity that the moral forces of mankind can muster. It will require moral unity between Protestants and Catholics.
>
> Organized Protestantism seems bent not on helping that unity but on hindering it. If it continues on that road it is a safe assumption that, at the end of it, the Protestant Church deservedly will have lost whatever right it has to speak for the conscience of the nation.

Dr. High here emphasizes the one point which seems to us to be unescapable on this Vatican issue—namely, its insignificance in the face of events which threaten our whole culture and civilization, not to say religion, with extinction. Talk about Nero fiddling while Rome was burning—imagine a great religious conference debating the Taylor appointment while Hitler was ravaging Norway and crashing into Holland! Nor is this the whole of it! So far from opposing or censoring this appointment, why should we not sustain it and praise it? Good God, are the churches, Catholic and Protestant, going to stand apart in this hour, nursing ancient grudges and suspicions, while the world crashes to ruin? In floods or storms, cats and dogs, wolves and lambs, have been seen crouching together in refuge from disaster. If only to survive, all Christians must clasp hands and close up ranks. Also, they are bound alike to God and man to forget all differences in the one common need of saving mankind before it is too late. The Pope is a potent influence for peace. Let the President work with him in all ways most effective and beneficent.

ON THE STREET CORNER

We have been standing on the street corner, watching the crowds go by. What are some of our impressions? That the women are ugly to the point of horror—not their persons, but their hats, and clothes, and cosmetic adornments. * * * That the men are most of them dowdy and ill-kempt—as the women care most how they look, so the men care least how they look. * * * That most men and women have little interest in one another—it is unusual to see one individual eying another. * * * That most people are not going anywhere in particular, or at any particular time —a wholly inconsequential event will stop the stream of passersby and collect a crowd. * * * That most men and an increasing number of women smoke as they walk—the cigarette is ubiquitous. * * * That women walk in much better form than men—their posture, their stride, their grace of movement are altogether superior to that of men, who are mostly slouches. * * * That women like to wear new shoes, the nobbier the better, while men like to wear old shoes, the shabbier the better. * * * That business must be poor for the bootblacks. * * * That jay-walking is on the decline—few persons now cross in the middle of the block. * * * That the habit of walking four or five abreast is as persistent as it is boorish, and as unconscious as it is persistent. * * * That postmen look tired, policemen sleek, and messenger boys static. * * * That dogs are rapidly taking the place of children. * * * That an alarmingly large number of women are egregious exhibitionists. * * * That few persons smile, or look carefree and happy, as though they were enjoying life. * * * That interest in store-windows is negligible—why is so much labor expended in decorating them? * * * That many men now wear no hats, and young women are beginning to carry their hats in their hands (we don't wonder!!). * * * That men's umbrellas are rapidly disappearing, and women's umbrellas becoming more grotestque. * * * That the pedlars of yesteryear are a lost tribe. * * * That noise is infernal and interminable, and nobody seems to hear it at all. * * * That most persons are rude, and the bigger the crowd the ruder they get. * * * That most persons are also good-natured; while often rude, they are almost never mad. * * * That gumchewing, the acme of vulgarity, is becoming a common practice. * * * That collisions between passersby are not infrequent, and that if pedestrians traveled as fast as automobiles, there would be casualties. * * * That humans in the mass are endlessly amusing, often pitiable, and always lovable.

Sound

Push forward, Sound! and let your music sway
In swift vibration; let the air-waves grow
While drifting into space in ebb and flow.
Adroit momentum yields an interplay
With rhythmic motion. Rushing waves obey
The cosmic laws, and only mind can know
Of air concussions made, as fast and slow,
All movement glides in grave and mad relay.

Let Laws of the Universe, which serve all men,
Keep oneness with the future they control;
Retune the ear to sounds that thrill and awe;
Unfold the secret cosmic law, and then,
Let symphonies of ages fill the soul
With perfect sound that rings without a flaw.

GRACE KIESS SWIGGETT.

Jottings

An American scientist has discovered that temperature has a definite effect on stature. A rise in temperature is associated with a decrease in stature, and correspondingly a fall in temperature brings an increase in stature. All of which explains, we suppose, why the Eskimos are such giants!

"Our Defense Steps Satisfy President."
Headline in the New York *Times*.

Something new under the sun, after all! A president satisfied with what is being done for the army and navy!

Luisa Tetrazzini and Rosina Galli died last month within a few days of one another. What Tetrazzini did with her voice Galli did with her feet. The singer and the dancer were alike *coloratura* artists of supreme distinction.

Einstein confesses that he cannot explain, or even understand, the world. He was speaking of the physical cosmos. But we might all say the same thing of the world of human affairs.

Every now and then things happen that are "too good to be true" and yet are true. Thus, the New York Society of the Pure-Minded held a meeting the other day, at which Bishop Manning spoke on "The Need for Morals in Mathematics." The meeting was held at the Church of the Holy Innocents!

The more we read the newspaper reports of what is happening in Europe these days, the more we feel that we are reading an H. G. Wells' horror-story come to life.

J. H. H.

Emma Goldman*

CURTIS W. REESE

We are gathered in solemn reverence about the bier of an immortal. As in life no prison wall could restrain, so in death no grave can contain her spirit. Now and henceforth Emma Goldman dwells in the corridors of affectionate memory, walking with stately tread the halls reserved for the great of all the ages; a status well beyond the reach of earthly powers.

I

By all the valid tests of greatness, Emma Goldman was a great personality. In simplicity and clarity of thought, in vision and courage, in power of self-sacrifice and in daring deeds, in great hope for human good and in immeasurable loyalty to her ideals, Emma Goldman stands undimmed by the great men and women of all time. The true tests of immortal greatness are not defined in terms of the ideological content of any person or time or place. Great personalities rise above the specific and the concrete, and must be measured in terms of qualities and purposes that transcend the conventional and ephemeral. By the standard of greatness of mind and purpose, of depth of feeling and passionate loyalty, of grand conceptions and unfaltering devotion, Emma Goldman was a great personality.

II

Emma Goldman was the world's outstanding advocate of liberty. If in the short run, hers was an overbelief, none who believe in the long-run triumph of the human spirit can doubt the ultimate validity of her belief in liberty. She trusted liberty, and she condemned restraints on liberty other than those imposed by the inner discipline of civilized intelligence. To her, liberty was a touchstone by which to test all systems, all religions, and all government. Failure to meet this test was to her unanswerable evidence of an essentially defective heart at the center of any social order, whatever its claims might be. At a time like this, when liberty of thought, speech, and press, liberty of person and of life itself are violated by tyrants, and betrayed by the very elect, lovers of liberty everywhere will mourn the loss of the last great advocate of a genuinely free society of free men, by free men, and for free men.

III

Emma Goldman was a great friend and lover of humanity. Whatever men and women suffered from oppression and wherever they struggled for freedom, in her they found a champion and a spokesman. In behalf of the rights and liberties of people everywhere, her pen was liquid and her tongue was a flame of fire. For her comrades of whatever race or nation, languishing in whatever prisons and concentration camps, she poured out her message of appeal in words of eloquence second to none yet uttered by any lips. Loving humanity as she did, she refused to close her eyes to the inequalities and the inequities of the world. No person and no power was too great to come under the withering blast of her scorn for oppression, and no one was too humble to come within the reach of her outstretched hand. The generosity of her heart encompassed the race, and she knew no stranger in the outpouring of her zeal for human betterment.

In all these ways and in innumerable other ways, Emma Goldman was a power in behalf of the deeper and the finer things of life. All who walked with her in the general direction of her goal of freedom, even amid differences on the strategy of the journey, felt the power of her will and experienced her understanding heart. She knew human frailties, but she had confidence in the essential trustworthiness of the children of Mother Earth. While she no longer walks with us the crowded ways of life, the things she did, the feelings she had, and the thoughts she held will live forever to enrich and ennoble the world that she loved.

*Address at the funeral of Emma Goldman, Chicago, May 17, 1940.

Should America Enter Into the War?

An Interview with Royal Wilbur France*

E. F. Dr. France, there have been a number of addresses and interviews of late in which the speakers have indicated that the United States should help England and France, even to the extent if necessary, to prevent the defeat of these nations, of going into the war itself. Do you concur in that view?

Dr. F. Emphatically not. The world democracy savers appear to have forgotten the lessons of history, especially the sad lessons of the past twenty-five years. But the American people have not done so.

E. F. Why do you say that the American people have not forgotten?

Dr. F. The public opinion polls continue to confirm the determination of the United States to keep out of the present war. Last September the Gallup poll showed that only 44 per cent of the population favored entering on the side of France and England even if that should be necessary to prevent a German victory. It is now only 23 per cent for intervention in such an event.

E. F. Does this mean that we should not be concerned in the troubles of Europe?

Dr. F. Certainly not. The world is too closely knit today for any country to remain indifferent to these catastrophic events. We must be and are deeply concerned. But after the experience of the last war when we went in and won for the Allies only to find that we had lost the peace and that the so-called peace treaty was no treaty of peace at all, but was fraught in almost every line with causes of new wars, we have made up our minds as a people that we can help not only ourselves but the warring countries best by remaining aloof from the conflict. If we can preserve sanity and democracy and normal economic productivity here, we may be of immense importance to the world when the present madness has spent itself.

E. F. In what way do you mean?

Dr. F. In binding up the wounds of a stricken Europe and in influencing the peace. We should try to read history straight, keep our emotions under the control of our reason and work for a fair and just settlement of the causes which underlie this long and bitter conflict.

E. F. What are those causes as you see them, Dr. France?

Dr. F. They have their origin in what we know as the Industrial Revolution. The economic problems of the world were profoundly changed. Production became ever more plentiful but no nation learned to distribute wages to the masses of its own people corresponding to its capacity for production. Hence the industrialized nations sought markets abroad. When a country like England or Germany becomes industrialized and develops machinery, another problem arises. Machines, like men, are hungry. They must be fed with raw materials. England was the first country to capitalize on the Industrial Revolution. Indeed it began there. So England changed from a self-sufficient nation to a great world industrial organization, a world power dependent on the outside world for raw materials and markets. What she wanted she took with ruthless disregard for the rights of other peoples. Her Empire spread over the world. It imposed itself by force and maintained itself by force. France followed suit. Germany entered the game of empire late.

E. F. And then Germany embarked on the course of empire?

Dr. F. Yes. When it became unified, the technically-minded genius of the German people resulted in the same need for raw materials and markets as had motivated other nations. At the beginning of the present century Germany had secured some colonies. She asked for equal rights with France in Morocco. The answer of France, England, and Russia was the Triple Entente. From the German viewpoint a ring of steel had been drawn about her. A counter alliance between Germany, Austria, and Italy was formed and Europe was divided into two hostile camps. There was neither the wisdom, good will, nor statesmanship available in Europe to avoid the inevitable conflict. Europe was living on a powder keg to which the Sarajevo murders set the spark. The war began and Germany won.

E. F. What do you mean by that? I thought she lost.

Dr. F. She won the war with England, France, and Russia. By 1917 Russia had gone into revolution and out of the war. France was exhausted and war-weary. English self-sufficiency was being definitely threatened by the terrific destruction of British ships which reached its peak early in 1917. At this point we intervened and saved a lost cause. Germany won from her enemies in Europe, but when we came in with all of our fresh power and resources, her jig was up. What follows represents one of the most miserable and tragic chapters in world history. From it we should learn the lesson that victorious nations are scarcely ever generous or even decently just, even when led by a man like Woodrow Wilson, who had himself declared that the only enduring peace would be a peace without victory.

E. F. When did Wilson make the statement advocating peace without victory?

Dr. F. Before we entered the war. Wilson had asked the people of the United States to remain neutral in deed and thought. He was reëlected to the presidency in 1916 on a straight peace issue. Within a few months he led us into the war and I sat on the floor of the House of Representatives as a guest of my brother, who was then a United States Senator, and heard him demand the use of force without stint or limit. Many historians feel that the reason for our change of policy was that we had geared up our entire economy to supplying the war needs of England and France, that we had staked billions loaned to these nations on their success, and that when their cause was endangered, we went in. Certainly the letter of Ambassador Page, our envoy to England, pointing out the danger of losses to us if the Allies should lose, bears out this theory. Of course, the unrestricted submarine warfare as well as Germany's intrigues in Mexico and other factors contributed to our final decision. In any event, we changed from a peace to a war policy and won the war.

*Dr. France is Professor of Economics at Rollins College, Florida. He was interviewed on March 18, 1940, for the radio by Mr. Everett Farnsworth.—*Editor.

E. F. What happened after that?

Dr. F. When Germany asked President Wilson on what terms she could have peace, he declared that the powers allied against Germany had no quarrel with the German people and that if the people of Germany would throw out the Kaiser and his crowd, whom he held responsible for starting the war, he assured them of a just and generous peace on the basis of his fourteen points. There was no word of stripping Germany not only of her colonies but of a large part of her own soil in Europe, nothing about the staggering reparations later imposed, no suggestion that enemy troops would be encamped on German soil, nor of the whole impossible structure that became the Treaty of Versailles and the allied post-war attempt to keep Germany a subjugated people. All impartial students of that document signed by Clemenceau, Lloyd George, Orlando, and Woodrow Wilson knew that it could not and should not long endure. The German people had revolted against the Kaiser and he fled to Holland. They set up a democratic government and sent delegates to the peace conference. But the Germans were never invited to the council table. During the long months while the four men debated the terms of peace, the British blockade was tightened around Germany. The hungry Germans were not even allowed to draw fish from the North Sea. Despite the fact that I had been opposed to our entering the war I became an officer in the American army. I went into Germany myself after the armistice and saw for myself the effects of the starvation of German women and children after the Germans had laid down their arms. It was one of the cruelest chapters in history. There followed the bringing in of the delegates of the new German Republic to the Versailles council room. These men who had opposed the Kaiser and urged their people to have faith in the allied promises and make peace were forced to sign the treaty with all its unworkable and impossible features, and place on themselves for the Republic the stigma of admitting that Germany was solely responsible for the war, which no German believed. Later came Poincaré, who stood in France for the narrow, intolerant nationalism, which Hitler now represents in Germany, and under him the French occupation of the Ruhr, the miseries and difficulties of the German people and their struggling democracy, and at last Hitler, who represents not the best but the worst emotions of Germany.

E. F. You feel as I do, then, that Hitler represents a menace to world peace and order?

Dr. F. I most certainly do. The only difference of opinion between men of good will is how to deal with the bitter spirit that Hitler embodies. I think that the very first condition of learning how to deal with it is to find out what caused it. Nations are like men. We all have our just and generous sides and our bitter and antagonistic sides. We can both love and hate. If you want to know how the worst side of a fellow comes to the top in him, try a simple psychological experiment. Get into a fight with another fellow. If he gets you down and you cry quits, and then when he has you helpless he steps on your face with hobnailed boots, kicks you, and every time you try to rise he knocks you down—by that time if your worst passions are not uppermost you will be one of nature's supermen. That was what happened to Germany. That miserable little strutter on the stage of history, Adolf Hitler, is an expression of the worst passions of the German people, but I feel that England and France and we ourselves are as much if not more responsible for him than are the people of Germany who after the war wanted nothing so much as democracy and peace. I knew when I visited Germany and France and England after the war and talked with people of good will in all those countries who hated what had been done at Versailles that Hitler or some one like him was almost an inevitability unless justice were done to the German people. Therefore I cannot get worked up into the feeling that Hitler is the sole cause of present difficulties any more than if I saw a man deliberately impregnate himself with smallpox germs I could think that the resultant pox were the cause of his sickness. There is a moral order, and its law is that what we sow we shall reap. We sowed hate at Versailles and we have reaped Hitlerism.

E. F. Why did President Wilson ever sign the Versailles treaty?

Dr. F. Wilson was an idealist. Sometimes idealists can ignore harsh realities. Also, Wilson believed that if he signed the treaty which contained the provision for the League, the League would make right the wrongs of the treaty. In this he was mistaken, because for one thing we did not even enter the League, for a complex of reasons. No one can now say to what extent we might have influenced the situation had we gone in, but we stayed out and the nations which were in the League failed to use it to create terms of justice and a sound international order.

E. F. Were not real efforts made later to correct the evils of the treaty?

Dr. F. There were. The leaders of the new German Republic showed great patience and restraint. Briand and MacDonald, broader and more generous men, succeeded Poincaré and Lloyd George in the seats of power, and these men and men like Streseman in Germany were gradually eliminating the mistakes of the treaty when the world depression came. I believe, despite all its troubles, that the new German Republic would have pulled through if the new economic troubles of the great depression had not struck an already economically weary Germany. That gave Hitler his great chance to blame everything that had happened on the Republic and on the Jews, and to establish his dictatorship.

E. F. Do you believe that in the present war England and France are fighting to defend democracy?

Dr. F. No, I do not. They failed to help German democracy to survive. They made no move to protect democracy in Spain, but on the contrary they helped to throttle it. They sold Czechoslovakia down the river and took up arms in defense of Poland, which was one of the worst dictatorships in the whole world. I see this war as simply a struggle in power politics. That does not mean that I do not sympathize with the suffering people of Poland and of France and England as I do with those of Germany. I lived for almost a year in post-war France and came to know and admire the French people, and I have spent a good deal of time both in England and Germany. It is not the people of any country who want war. If they could be told the truth, they want nothing so much as peace and the chance to work in security. But they are taught by politicians with dreams of empire in their heads to fear and hate. One of the most brilliant of American correspondents in Europe was Vincent Sheean. Let me read you a passage from his book, entitled

Personal History. Speaking of Poincaré, who succeeded Clemenceau as premier of France and engineered the French occupation of the Ruhr, he says:

> M. Poincaré was not only the first politician I ever observed at close range; he was also the least imposing, the least suited to his historic role. He had no charm of any sort, no ease of manner, little dignity; his substitute for it was a sort of stiff-necked provincial didacticism. Compared to any other political leader of the same rank known to me afterwards—Briand, MacDonald, Streseman, Mussolini—he seemed harsh, little-minded and inhuman. I never heard him make a generous statement in political matters and did not believe he was capable of such a thing. From hearing and seeing him repeatedly throughout the two momentous years I reached the conclusion that he hated the Germans as a Jersey farmer hates a rattlesnake. In his sharp, piggish eyes and his piercing voice there came a suggestion of terror and loathing whenever he had occasion to use the words Allemagne and Allemand. Deformed, crippled and cramped by patriotic passion, he could not see straight in any question involving the immediate interests of his own country (as they were conceived to be under the patriotico-national-capitalist dispensation) or the most ordinary rights of that eternal enemy Germany. If I lived to be a thousand I could never forget the sound of his maniac shriek as he pronounced the word Allemagne. The whole curse of Europe was in it and as I grew familiar with the behavior and ideas of M. Poincaré I could see that the implacability of his hatred, the venom of his curse, was his principal—indeed, almost his only—qualification for his destiny. Few men can have filled so great a place in human affairs with so little.

Substitute for the name Poincaré that of Hitler, and for the eternal enemy Germany the phrase the eternal enemy France, and in this pen picture of Poincaré you have the Hitler of today to the life. It is this spirit in all countries that we must be on our guard against. One more thing about democracy. There is not much in England today and still less in France, and if we get into the war we will lose ours. The best way to preserve democracy is to preserve peace.

E. F. Do you not, however, consider England a great exponent and defender of democracy in the world despite her failure to save the German and Spanish and Czech democracies?

Dr. F. Not throughout the world. England has an honorable history with respect to the freedom of the individual and the rights of man, while the record of Nazi Germany in respect to human dignity and freedom of the individual is a dark blot on the page of history. Hitler's treatment of his political opponents and of the Jews and of conquered peoples should be condemned without qualification by every right-thinking person. But the other day through the screen which censorship is imposing on world events came the voice of a prominent leader from India asking "for whose democracy are the 400 million people of India supposed to fight?" Great Britain is an empire and as such has blocked the yearnings of millions of people for democracy and self-government, and if you think she is free from a class and caste system even at home, read the article in *Harpers* for March, entitled "The Long Watch in England." Democracy is a precious thing, but it can only be preserved by preserving stable conditions and this means solving our domestic problems instead of trying to be the world's policeman.

E. F. What do you mean by that?

Dr. F. Why, if we had tried merely in the last two decades to right all the world's wrongs in Europe, Asia, and Africa, we should certainly have had a job on our hands. Think for a minute of the wars we would have to fight if we tried to become the champion of democracy and establish it by force of arms throughout the world. We should be fighting England to free impoverished India, we should be fighting Italy to restore democracy in Spain, and to release her hold on Ethiopia and Albania, we should be fighting France to free Morocco and Indo-China, we should be fighting Germany to restore self-government to Austria, Czechoslovakia and Poland, we should be fighting Russia over Poland and Finland, we should have another big fight going on to pry Japan loose from the body of China, and if settling these minor problems left us any time for questions of domestic justice we might turn our attention to our own unemployment and racial problems, and work at restoring the freedom of speech and press and conscience which our crusading into foreign wars would lose for us. Obviously, this is nonsense. Nobody really believes that we can become responsible for righting the wrongs of the world. We have enough to do at home and the best contribution we can make to world peace is to keep out of world wars, but whenever England becomes involved we do remember the blood tie which so many of us have with England. We recall that England gave the Magna Charta to the world and has been a great contributor to political freedom and progress. We also have a sentimental attachment to France because of her help to us in the American Revolution and her contributions to freedom and the dignifying of the individual, and there is a strong and sincere urge in many breasts to get into the struggle on their side. This time, however, I think America has learned its lesson and I hope that we will avoid even those preliminary steps which lead down into the abyss of war.

E. F. Yet you are not an isolationist?

Dr. F. By no means! Isolationism implies indifference to moral issues and the world struggle. I want America to be neutral, but not indifferent, so that when the time comes to discuss peace our moral influence with all the powers will count. I want America to plan for that peace. We must first think in terms of economic justice to all the peoples of the world in respect to the raw materials and resources of the world. The foundation of peace is economic justice. We must then think and plan for world organization along the lines of an Association of Nations to Enforce Peace such as President Hamilton Holt of Rollins College suggested years ago and which was ably expounded the other evening by the Chinese Ambassador Hu Shih in his address at Rollins; and this time we must play a part in such a world organization commensurate with our power and responsibility. Perhaps regional organization will have to precede world organization. Isolationism is negative. Belligerency is negative. I am pro-British, pro-French, pro-German, pro-Japanese, pro-Chinese, pro-Finnish, pro-Russian, pro-Italian, pro-Spanish, pro-Ethiopian, pro-Mexican, and pro all peoples, above all pro-American, but I am anti-imperialist because I am pro-humanity and want to see a peaceful and just settlement of world affairs so that this recurring world agony may cease and humanity may stop committing suicide.

E. F. But suppose Germany wins. Is there any danger of Germany attacking us?

Dr. F. None whatever, for three simple reasons. Germany can never win in the sense that your question implies. It would take instruments of naval fighting which she does not possess and which it would take years to create to win in the sense of destroying the

huge English and French navies and gaining the mastery of the seas. She does not contemplate any such thing and has never at any time tried to build a navy adequate to the task. Secondly, even if by some miracle Germany could supplant England as mistress of the seas every responsible military and naval expert whose testimony I have seen has declared that a German invasion of the United States is a military impossibility. Even if there were no British and French fleets left, or if they were neutral, we have now the greatest navy in the world, a navy which it would take Germany decades to match. Even if this navy were beaten, imagine Germany moving a few shiploads of soldiers across the Atlantic and landing them on Long Island. Where would Germany get troopships to transport a million men? Where would they be able to find dock facilities not guarded by guns? Even if they landed troops, before they could be reinforced they would be captured and put into concentration camps. Even if they overcame all these difficulties, how could they keep the troops supplied? In the third place, wars arise out of fundamental economic conflicts, and we do not have the type of economic rivalry with any European power that would be at all likely to lead to an attack on us. I have not time to amplify that point. Study it and you will see what I mean.

E. F. I see your point. You consider a German attack on us politically unlikely and strategically impossible?

Dr. F. Precisely. I think you may rest assured that no European power would seriously contemplate an attack on the territory of the United States. These things are said because they arouse fear. Fear arouses hate, and hate leads to war. If at a distance of 3,000 miles from the conflict some Americans can be made afraid, you can see how difficult it must be for European peoples to keep free from fear and hate. They need our help, but with ideas, not arms.

E. F. Let me ask you if it is not true that Chamberlain made a real effort at Munich to avoid the present conflict?

Dr. F. That is true. While Chamberlain and the English Tories are not the people in whose hands I like to see the destinies of England, we must not overlook the fact that the failure to live up to their treaty obligations with Czechoslovakia was an expression by France and England of their desire to avoid this war. In going in person to Munich, Chamberlain went to great lengths, even reprehensible lengths from the point of view of English obligations to Czechoslovakia, to appease German demands. Hitler, after promising to respect what was left of Czechoslovakia, proved conclusively that his word is not to be trusted. When he began his threats against Poland, England and France made promises to Poland. If they had broken their pledges again, their influence in Europe would have been at an end. But Hitler did not want war, either. On the other hand, a dictator like Hitler lives by successes and by performing miracles and he got himself so far out on the limb with his demands on Poland that he could not withdraw without eating humble pie, which a dictator cannot very well do. The tragic thing is that the whole imperial and balance-of-power system leads nations to war not only against the real desire of the peoples but often of the statesmen as well. That is why I said that we must turn our attention to the economic causes that underlie war and to the kind of settlement and organization of the nations on which peace may be built.

E. F. What is the way out, Dr. France?

Dr. F. Unfortunately there is no easy way out. There are these possibilities:

1. An early victory for England and France which is improbable.
2. An early victory for Germany which is improbable.
3. A revolution in Germany which is at present improbable.
4. A revolution in France or England which is at present improbable.
5. A negotiated peace which at present would be equivalent to a German victory and hence is not now probable.
6. A long-drawn-out war of attempted starvation ending in mutual exhaustion which is the most likely outcome.

The Europe which will emerge from this struggle will be bowed down with staggering debts, disillusioned with war and the leadership which led to war, and perhaps ready for a New Deal of a kind that will take account of world resources in terms of world needs and the necessity for an international organization for the maintenance of peace and the rebuilding of European civilization.

E. F. That is where we will come in?

Dr. F. Yes. We cannot possibly reorganize Europe at the present juncture. It is not our job. Europe must learn its own lesson, as we did in 1787, of the necessity of mutual coöperation and organization. But if we keep out of this war and keep our own minds clear and free from the hatreds war engenders, we can enormously assist in the task; and this time I hope we may play our part in the new world organization.

E. F. But should not Germany and Russia and Japan and the other countries be punished for their aggressions?

Dr. F. I will answer that question in regard to Germany, for the same principle applies to all. The trouble with the punishment theory is that it assumes an abstraction to be real. There is no such thing existing as Germany. There is land occupied by Germans, but if we punish land we hurt, not help, civilization. Sherman punished land in his march to the sea and it took the South years to get over the devastation. Then there are Germans, but those Germans whom we punish will not be the ones who are guilty. We went all through that in the last world war. We were going to punish the Kaiser. But the Kaiser is living out his allotted span at Doorn in Holland, while millions of innocent Germans lie dead or are going through life maimed—Germans who had no more to do with framing German governmental policy than have you or I. I would even go so far as to say, now that the passions of 1914-1918 have subsided, that the Kaiser by his simplicity and dignity in exile is actually commanding the respect of the world. If France and England could catch the Kaiser now, do you think they would hang him to the sour apple tree?

E. F. I suppose not.

Dr. F. No. In the light of history many things assume new aspects. We must strive to keep our heads cool and endeavor to the best of our ability to realize in practice institutions that are based on justice in terms of international realities, and an international organization to maintain world peace. The time may yet come when we will consider Jesus not as a dreamer of dreams but as our wisest and most practical guide in the difficult art of living.

Toward a Pacifist Philosophy

WENDELL THOMAS

In working for a peaceful civilization, pacifism cannot rely entirely on Christan dogma. For the most prominent systems of Christian dogma are not fundamentally pacific. The Roman Catholic Church, for example, still approves of the "just war." While many Protestant convocations have recently declared war to be inconsistent with Christ's teachings, this belated admirable conclusion is at odds with dogmas of loyalty to the state. Christian sects that have courageously obeyed the New Testament in defiance of state law do not profess a philosophy of civilization.

Certain pacifists, like Bertrand Russell and Norman Thomas, have rested their case on a liberal or socialistic tradition. But the pacifist views of such thinkers are ragged around the edges. Norman Thomas leaves the door open to class warfare of some sort when he writes in his book, *War,* "The sane revolutionist in a country like the United States will not feel that he can utterly renounce the use of violence as a weapon for the exploited while the exploiters still cling tenaciously to it." And Bertrand Russell frankly confesses, in *Which Way to Peace,* "I am not a believer in the doctrine of non-violence. . . . I do not hold that war is always and everywhere a crime. . . . A small war for a great end may do more good than harm." Despite the contributions made to civilization by the liberal and Socialist movements, neither seems to furnish a reliable foundation for pacifism. After all, neither movement ever intended to do so.

Ecclesiastical dogmas and political stereotypes have supported pacifism, if at all, by indirection. Direct support comes from certain religious thinkers and their disciples in Christan and non-Christian movements throughout the world: Vedanta Hindu seers and Gautama; Lao-tse and the Greek Anaximander; Jesus, St. Paul, and the early Christians; St. Francis, medieval mystics, and Erasmus; the Anabaptists and Socinians; Spinoza and current Biosophy; George Fox, the Friends, and the Fellowship of Reconciliation; Emerson and Thoreau; the Bahai movement and the New History Society; Tolstoi, Gandhi, and Kagawa.

Any philosophy adequate to pacifism would be required, it seems, to draw from these sources. In fact, several contemporary thinkers are finding in them material for a pacifistic philosophy. Outstanding among these thinkers is Aldous Huxley, a recent convert, whose *Ends and Means, Encyclopaedia of Pacifism,* and peace tracts have already been recognized as pacifist milestones. Because of his wide reading and varied sympathies, his brilliance and industry, his practical work in the Peace Pledge Union, his popular appeal and genius for clear statement, Huxley's pacifist philosophy will repay inspection, perhaps, better than any other.

Eager to fortify his new-found faith in every legitimate way, Huxley summons to his aid three distinct views. One is social romanticism, which assumes that man's end or goal is a future good society. At the beginning of *Ends and Means* Huxley asserts that general agreement exists as to this "ideal goal of human effort," this future "Golden Age." The only disagreement concerns the means of reaching this end. The second view is individualism. In the *Encyclopaedia of Pacifism* we read, "The ultimate realities of the human world are individual men and women. . . . Human personality must be respected. Individuals, in the words of Kant, must always be regarded as ends in themselves, not as means." Huxley's third view is ascetic dualism, according to which we should detach ourselves from the material world and unite with a non-material realm. Reality is a "mental-material conglomerate," of which the mental element is ultimate. Correct method is non-attachment to lust and possessions, and attachment to this ultimate mental reality, which is "impersonal and non-ethical."

Huxley has doubtless been influenced toward ascetic dualism by Gerald Heard, a colleague in the Peace Pledge Union. Rejecting both the anthropomorphism of antiquated religion and the "mechanomorphism" of antiquated science, Heard advocates a "third" position comparable to the dualistic Sankhya-Yoga view of Hinduism. In *The Third Morality* he writes:

> What we took to be a solid world around us . . . is really a mixture of ourselves and some unimaginable energy. . . . We and it are unbelievably involved and enmeshed. We have gradually and carefully . . . to extricate ourselves . . . till we can clearly distinguish . . . where we actually end and the outer reality begins. * * * The concept of objective reality as being a state of mind and of ourselves as minds attaining knowledge of and union with that state . . . this dual concept, which is cosmologically least open to objection of all cosmologies, is also ethically most workable.

Ethically, we should detach ourselves from "the outer reality," and attain union with an objective "state of mind."

Huxley's desire to enlist wide philosophic support for pacifism is commendable. But each of his three views by itself is defective, and each—quite naturally—conflicts with the others. Individualism is an ancient tenet reinforced by the Renaissance and the Reformation. It reveals itself in ecclesiastical splintering, in the *laissez-faire* principle of capitalism, and in a decadent liberalism which now stands desperately in the path of onrushing political forces. Prominent among these forces are Fascism, Communism, Naziism, and Japanese imperialism with its "new order in Asia"—each a form of social romanticism. Here is Huxley's first view in world conflict with his second, while his third view, ascetic dualism, seeks to escape from the conflict entirely.

This hodge-podge of romanticism, individualism, and dualism is so familiar in our culture that it can be made to look, superficially, like a single consistent view. Our goal is a future good society. Communist and pacifist agree on this "end," but differ as to means. The Communist suppresses, while the pacifist cherishes, the individual. Here the *laissez-faire* capitalist agrees with the pacifist. But the pacifist rejects violence. The individual cherished by pacifism must be a non-violent individual; and the way to become a non-violent individual is to detach yourself from the material world of possessions, and attach yourself to "ultimate reality." United to ultimate impersonal mind, you are properly prepared to work for the future good society. This is Huxley's philosophy in a nutshell, with social romanticism, individualism, and ascetic dualism nicely combined.

It would be easy for a red-blooded critic to attack

asceticism, or for a social-minded critic to attack individualism. But let us begin with the romantic assumption that our end or goal is a future age. Referring to *Ends and Means,* Kingsley Martin writes in *The Political Quarterly* (April, 1938): "Mr. Huxley's book is logically unsatisfactory because he nowhere discusses the problem of ends and means with which his book is mainly concerned." Correct. The book states at the outset that a future "Golden Age" is the end. But the assumption of common agreement on this point cannot be made; for the more detailed and practical is our conception of this Golden Age, the more will it differ from the other fellow's conception, and the more intense will become the conflict between ideologies that are irreconcilable because each is an absolute "end." Moreover, many thinkers reject the whole idea of an end that resides in the future. Criticism could demolish this nineteenth century view; it is sufficient for our purpose to note its unpeaceful nature.

Why cannot pacifists declare simply that *the end is peace?* Why cannot religious pacifists affirm moreover, that *peace is God?* We must be careful, however, about the conception of God. To avoid dualism, with its endless complications and other-worldly ascetic method, we should conceive God not as "mind" opposed to "matter," but as the *unbounded individual whole*—at once the world's natural ground, active power, and final goal. This conception is a philosophic rendering of the fundamental religious attitude common to our pacifist sources, such as the Vedanta seers and George Fox. Here God is individual or personal—in fact, the only individual or indivisible power. Any act or structure, such as a human deed or a human body, has individuality only because the individual God is its self and substance. The one divine person appears variously as many organisms. You and I are not merely human beings: we are basically God appearing as human beings.

The liberal is stirred by a profound impulse when he declares the individual to be the end for which society exists. His grave mistake is to assume, humanistically, that the individual is many men. Many men, many "ends." Competition, struggle, mastery, exploitation. No basic peace, no common ground, no community. Horrified by such individualism, Heard and Huxley take refuge in the notion that ultimate reality is impersonal and non-individual. This lands them in misty asceticism. But we need not deny that ultimate reality is individual: we need only deny that human "individuals"—that is, human organic structures—are ultimate or by themselves fully individual. A human being is personal only insofar as he shares the activity of the divine person.

The social romanticist is right when he declares that the end justifies the means. If means are truly means, or integral instruments of the end, they are bound to be good if the end is good. The romantic mistake is to assume that the end is a future age or society, an imaginary thing about which all sorts of ideological disputes are possible. Again we have many men, many "ends." Admittedly, the Communist and other men of violence are using wrong means. The reason is that each is controlled not by the one real divine end, ever present and common to all, but by some remote or proximate objective, falsely labelled an "end." If our goal is fundamentally false, its means will necessarily be false, whether violent or non-violent. But if we take the one individual God for our end—the common end of *natural active peace* without which we could not live, move, or have our being—then our means, justified by this divine end, will be the actual bits of good society which we find in the world around us. And our method, pacifist method, will be an experience of peace through developing these actual goods in imaginative and practical coöperation with our fellows.

Propaganda in News Reports About Finland

BEN SEGAL

Since the outbreak of hostilities in Europe last September, there has been a certain amount of objectivity in the reporting of war news in the American press. For the most part, dispatches and pictures released by both sides have been published. Furthermore, many newspapers have warned their readers to be on their guard because of censorship and propaganda.

The reporting of the Finnish-Russian conflict, however, was much less objective because of two main factors: overwhelming sympathy for Finland on the part of the American public, and sparseness of news reports given out by Russian sources.

The American correspondents covering the Finnish-Russian conflict sympathized with the Finns. So did American newspapers, with the exception of a few Communist publications, notably the New York *Daily Worker.* For the most part, we may assume news reports were not deliberately colored in order to influence American public opinion. But the news was colored by the sympathies of correspondents and editors, and by the lack of reports from the other side of the conflict; it had a propaganda *effect* whether or not there was a propanganda *purpose* behind it. As used in this paper, "propaganda" means the presence of bias or prejudice in the news—it denotes the converse of objective factual reporting.

The newspapers used in this study were the Chicago *Tribune,* Chicago *Daily News,* New York *Times,* and the New York *Daily Worker,* issued between December, 1939, and March, 1940. Several aspects of biased news reports seem to stand out, such as wishful thinking, slanting the news, use of emotionally-toned words, playing up, playing down, and omitting news, and the use of appeals and editorials in conjunction with the news from Finland.

In view of the known sympathies of the reporters (Leland Stowe stated that of all the reporters, only two were *not* pro-Finland) and of the American people, many of the headlines of reported Finnish victories, especially those emanating from distant points like Stockholm and Copenhagen, fall into the category of wishful thinking.

Leland Stowe in a dispatch in the *Daily News* on February 5th stated that if the reports from Finland were often confusing and contradictory, it was largely because circumstances compelled the reporting of all military engagements at second hand or after the event. The Finnish officers would only allow the correspond-

ents to come on the battlefields after the Finnish bodies had been cleared away. This naturally resulted in a dependency on Finnish communiques for news sources and tended to make it one-sided. On the other hand, the *Daily Worker* would print only the communiques from Moscow, which again presented only one side of the picture.

On December 27th, the *Tribune* ran a banner headline—"4000 REDS SLAIN IN RETREAT." The dispatch came out of Copenhagen. A bit further on we read: "The Russians have been *estimated* to have lost 4,000 men fighting in the last three days, dispatches from Finnish army headquarters said today." Still further in the column, "Finnish headquarters believed the Russian *withdrawal* in the north was about over . . ." —withdrawal, instead of retreat.

On the same day, the *Daily Worker* printed their communique from Moscow which stated, "Skirmishes, Gun Duels Along Front in Finland."

In the New York *Times* of December 30th the dispatch read: "Finns Say Russians Bomb Own Troops" —the sub-head, "See Errors Not Revolt." The *Tribune* on that day ran a big banner headline. "BOMB MUTINOUS RED TROOPS"—the sub-head read, "Russian Flyers Attack Own Men in Arctic." The dispatch was written by Donald Day: "A mutiny in one of the Red armies which are invading Finland, during which Soviet flyers bombed and machine-gunned the rebellious troops, was reported here today." Then in light type, but in parentheses: "The Associated Press reported from Helsingfors that the Russian drive in the Salla region bogged down when Russian artillery and planes shelled and bombed their own troops by mistake. The Soviet forces were said to be in confusion. British reports told of bloody and unexplained fighting between two Russian regiments in the Salla area. These reports said it was believed that each regiment took the other for a Finnish unit." Looking up in the New York Times the A. P. report to which Day referred, we found that the report read that it was the "Finnish News Agency which said these events were a result of errors and didn't indicate any belief that they were signs of revolt." The map which the *Tribune* printed to explain the day's events in the war had a caption reading: "Soviet Planes and Guns Bomb and Shell Own Troops."

On December 15th, the *Daily News* in the dispatch from Finland had a sub-head, "Believe Russ Shot Own Troops." In the article we read: "When the Red troops retired in panic on December 10th the Finns say they heard machine-gun firing behind the Russian lines. They assumed that many of these troops were shot down by the G. P. U. special forces that attacked their rear."

The above are only examples of what occurred during the months of the war. Day after day the papers came out with reports of thousands being ambushed, trapped, and killed, and of divisions being annihilated. Some one commented that more troops were reported killed than the total number of the Russian forces!

"Slanting the news" as used in this paper will mean injection of the bias of the writer. The best example of this is found in the implications made that the homes and hospitals were deliberately bombed. On January 1st, the dispatch in the *Tribune* said: "Russian air raiders elsewhere spread new death and terror. Red machine-gunner attacked a hospital train, the Finns announced officially, and fired on a clearly marked Red Cross ambulance from the air." Harold Denny writing in the *Times* that day said: "In the air were Soviet planes, opposed only by anti-aircraft fire which can do little except keep the enemy planes too high to bomb accurately." There seems to be a discrepancy in reporting that an ambulance was bombed and that the anti-aircraft guns kept the airplanes from bombing accurately.

"Soviet Flyers Set Abo Afire," was the head carried by the New York *Times* on January 2nd. But in the next day's dispatch by Harold Denny we read: "No loss of life and little material damage resulted from yesterday's Soviet air raids in Abo, Hangoe, and other objectives."

On January 22nd, the *Times* dispatch said: "By the strange affinity that Soviet bombs have for workers' dwellings, the most concentrated damage aside from that done to warehouses and similar structures was to a workers' settlement on the edge of town."

The same day another article read: "500 Planes yesterday dropped 3000 bombs, killing 3 persons and wounding 35." On the 23rd the *Times* dispatch had an item released by the High Command of the Anti-aircraft organization of Finland: "6667 bombs in week kill 18." "The growing ineffectiveness against the Finnish people is attributed to the increased skill of the people in quickly taking shelter and to the inaccuracy of the Soviet bombers, most of whose missiles fall, according to this report, into the sea or rivers or harmlessly on the countryside." On the 24th, the dispatch said that 19 civilians were killed and many more wounded when a Russian bomber scored a direct hit on an air-raid shelter during an attack on Murmes. The Soviet planes flew over the town machine-gunning civilians and killing and wounding still more. Another dispatch read: "Scandinavian dispatches said four hospitals had been bombed and a Finnish surgeon and seven nurses killed." The weather was clear at the time and hospitals were marked, it was said, and officials asserted that the attacks were deliberate. Whereas one day the dispatches speak of the ineffectiveness of the bombers, the next day direct hits are made on hospitals and air-raid shelters.

In this connection, it is interesting to recall George Seldes' comment on the bombing, which pointed out that deliberate air raids in Spain killed hundreds and thousands of civilians while the so-called air raids in Finland killed as few as two or three persons. It seems presumptuous to assume that the air raids on civilians were intentional, as made out by the newspapers.

The *Daily Worker* did its share of slanting the news. The fact that one never saw an account of any Russian losses would be a good indication of this. During the periods when the other papers were reporting the heaviest losses, the *Daily Worker* communiques consisted of phrases such as, "No Activity at Fronts," "Scouting and Reconnoitering Activities," "Soviet Planes in Action"; and for the dispatches of January 11th, 12th, and 13th, with a slight variation on the 14th, the same dispatch was used, "Local Scouting and Artillery Action on Finnish Front." The dispatch of the 28th of January read: "Heroism on a Mass Scale Marks the Red Army's Drive."

The technique of using emotionally-toned words was freely made use of by all the papers. The *Daily Worker* on December 30th in a large caption under a picture said: "Fire Photo Fakes to Aid Finnish War Lords—Reactionary newspapers, in Cuba, take a cue from the

Capitalist press in New York and fake pictures of Red Atrocities in Finland." Another of the same date read: "Reveal White Finns Asked Arms Here Two Months Ago." From the same source on December 15th, "The Red Army penetrated further into Finland on its mission of liberation." "Mannerheimers" and "White Guards" were other name-calling terms used by the *Daily Worker*.

In the Chicago *Tribune* on December 20th we read: "Hoover Holds Finns' Resistance as Heroic Episode of History," (a bit more subtle than the above but quite effective). Here is one from the New York *Times* of January 30th: "2 Valiant Finns, 14, Find New Life Here. Twin brother and sister grin amiably—So 'Brave' that Interpreter Weeps." From the *Daily News* on March 4th: "Stalwart Finns to Reject Peace that Destroys Honor." On February 27th: "Saga of Heroism at Finnish Fort Is Told by Stowe." Here are some interesting ones from the *Daily News* of December 16th: "Russia Gathers Its Derelicts to Conquer Finns." "Is Stalin Crazy? Ask Writers after Seeing Bedraggled Prisoners." "Russia Finds Self Despised by World and Balked in War." Other terms were: "Russian Hordes," "Brave Little Finland," "Honorable Finland," "Pagan Russia," and "Christian Finland."

Playing up, playing down, and omitting news was another technique made use of by all of the newspapers. The *Daily Worker* in all of its issues covering the War printed no dispatch from Finland, except toward the end of the conflict, when Finland admitted a defeat. The *Worker,* in addition, would speak of minor activities on the Finnish Front, and their average communique took up about ten lines. This gradually increased when the Russians started winning, until it was the lead article in nearly all of the issues of February and the first half of March.

The other papers would usually bury the Russian communique on the second page or still further back. Here is an illustration of the same news item handled by two of the papers. New York *Times* of January 7th: "22 Russian Planes Reported Down," in smaller letters—"Soviet Also Claims Ten," "Women and Children Killed in Bombings of Mikkels." *Daily Worker* on the same day: "Red Army Downs 10 White Guard Planes," "Soviet aviation made a number of successful raids on enemy reserves and on military objectives."

The linking of domestic issues with the Finnish situation, an example of the "transfer device," is best exemplified in the handling of the Finnish relief situation by the *Daily Worker*. On December 21st, in the *Worker*: "Murder at Bargain Prices." "The campaign to raise funds for General Mannerheim and his White Guard forces in Finland is one of the greatest frauds ever perpetrated upon the American public."

The favorite one of the *Worker* was to tie up the anti-war issue with the loan to Finland. On January 7th: "Congress Faces First War Test on Mannerheim Loan." "Step Toward Involvement; Congressmen Rush Bills to Aid White Guards."

In the *Daily News* on December 15th was the story, "Finland Pays on War Debt—Others Pass." "Finland paid on its war debt in the United States today despite its grim struggle against Russia. H. Procope, sombre Finnish minister, presented a check to the Secretary of the Treasury in an atmosphere charged with drama." This was placed next to another news column dealing with the Finnish situation.

In the Chicago *Tribune* on December 29th appeared the news item: "Hoover Praises Nation's Action to Assist Finns." This appeared next to the news item, "Finns Bomb Foes' Big Guns."

Finally, our sixth device or aspect of propaganda is that of using appeals and editorials presented with news. An example of this is shown in the *Daily News* printing indirect appeals for contributions to the Finnish cause at the end of the news story on Finland. "If you want to contribute to the relief of the Finns send your subscription to the Finnish Relief Fund, Inc., 220 South La Salle Street."

All of the newspapers studied have consciously or unconsciously presented the news in a way that harmonizes with their editorial views. This was especially true of the first part of the war. A news item which appeared in the New York *Times* on January 29th indicates the sympathy of the American press, "HOOVER THANKS PRESS FOR ITS HELP TO FINLAND—" "U. S. Newspapers Have Raised $305,525, He Reveals." The difficulties in obtaining news in Finland and the sparse reports from Russian sources tended to aid the lack of objective presentation. The *Daily Worker* consistently presented a one-sided view, while the other papers, although somewhat more objective, presented a biased picture of the Finnish-Russian conflict.

On the Pacifist Front

[UNITY will publish from time to time, under this heading, such news as can be gathered about pacifists and pacifist activities in these war days. We earnestly invite our readers to send us such items of interest as may come to their attention. *Editor.*]

XV

Protestant ministers, some fifty in number, and including many of the most distinguished and influential religious leaders of the country, have issued a formal statement denouncing war and refusing definitely to have any part in it. The signatories are:

William S. Abernethy, Baptist; William H. Alderson, Methodist; M. Forest Ashbrook, Baptist; Roland H. Bainton, Yale Divinity School; Shelton Hale Bishop, Episcopal; Howard Black, Y.M.C.A.; Charles F. Boss, Jr., Methodist; W. Russell Bowie, Union Theological Seminary; David Braun, Presbyterian; Hugh Elmer Brown, Congregational; Hugh Chamberlin Burr, Federation of Churches, Rochester, N. Y.; George A. Buttrick, Presbyterian; J. Henry Carpenter, Brooklyn Church and Mission Federation, Brooklyn; Allan Knight Chalmers, Broadway Tabernacle Church, New York; A. Burns Chalmers, Dept. of Religion, Smith College; Bernard C. Clausen, Baptist; Albert Buckner Coe, Congregational; Henry H. Crane, Methodist; Dorr Diefendorf, Drew Theological Seminary; Ralph E. Dieffendorfer, Board of Foreign Missions, Methodist; Phillips P. Elliott, Presbyterian; Norman D. Fletcher, Unity Church, Montclair, N. J.; Harry Emerson Fosdick, Riverside Church, New York; John Gass, Episcopal; John Haynes Holmes, Community Church, New York; Laurence T. Hosie, Labor Temple, New York; Finis S. Idleman, Disciples of Christ; William Lloyd Imes, Presbyterian; John Paul Jones, Union Church, Brooklyn; John Howland Lathrop, Unitarian; W. Appleton Lawrence, Springfield, Mass.; Sidney Lovett, Yale University; Halford E. Luccock, Yale Divinity School; Eugene W. Lyman, Union

Theological Seminary; Elmore McKee, Episcopal; A. J. Muste, Labor Temple, New York; Morgan Noyes, Presbyterian; A. Clayton Powell, Jr., Abyssinian Baptist; W. Glenn Roberts, Brooklyn Church and Mission Federation; W. John Nevin Sayre, Fellowship of Reconciliation; Paul Scherer, Lutheran; Robert W. Searle, Greater N. Y. Federation of Churches; Ralph W. Sockman, Methodist; Frederick K. Stamm, Jr., Community Church, Brooklyn; Arthur L. Swift, Jr., Union Theological Seminary; Ernest Fremont Tittle, Methodist; Luke M. White, Episcopal; Robert C. Whitehead, Congregational; C. Lawson Willard, Jr., Episcopal.

The statement signed by these men follows:

These days of deep distress, marked on the one hand by bitter strife between nations and on the other by an almost universal passion for peace among all the peoples of the earth, seem to dictate unavoidably a confession of the faith that is in us. Humbly and to that end alone we the undersigned would submit the following statement:

With no desire to judge those who differ from us, whether actively engaged in war or advocating positions which we profoundly distrust as likely to eventuate in war, respecting their sincerity, and with the hope of equal sincerity ourselves as we claim them to be our brethren in Christ;

And with no intent, at this safe distance from the area of violent stress, to appraise the guilt of the nations engaged in conflict, assured that such an attempt must of necessity be all too uncritical and bound to suggest a self-righteous sense of superiority which we would most earnestly disclaim;

We yet would deliberately dissociate ourselves both from those who advocate an irresponsible and negative position as isolationists and from others who enter the lists as naive and sentimental perfectionists, dreaming of an unrealizable Utopia;

And would first of all acknowledge that we as Americans have deeply shared in the selfishness and indifference which have brought about this conflict; summoning ourselves, with those who find as we do, to a repentance both personal and national that shall bear the fruits of repentance in some greater social and economic justice at home, as well as in a freer, more determined and realistic fellowship with the other nations and races of the earth.

We would re-affirm further, without regard to expediency and with a mind only to that Voice which is not the sum or average of human voices, our conviction that the supreme and most immediate ethical question involved in the current strife between the nations is the question of War itself, over and above any question of democratic *versus* totalitarian ideology. War itself is the enemy which bids fair to destroy us all alike, to deprive us all of our democratic liberties, and to leave human life a prey to the ills of physical and moral exhaustion and the organized Christian Church open to the charge of utter impotence or of championing a relativistic ethic little better than opportunism.

We profoundly believe that the end forever inheres within the means; that the means employed by War are essentially evil; that the Good needs no aid of that Evil to establish its ultimate victory; that Love needs no abetting by Hate; that God has not come to such a pass as to require violence for the realization of any ideal that He inspires; that the Cross of Christ, with its passionate insistence on redemption through voluntary and defenseless suffering, no matter what the cost may be to us, is potent of itself beyond our thought; and that ultimately nothing else is.

We believe that War as an instrument of national policy settles no issues in the moral realm, is futile in the political, wasteful and suicidal in the economic, and in the religious, a denial of God and of the life and teaching of His Son.

And we believe in consequence that the time has come when arbitrament by War must be abolished, as trial by ordeal was abolished, as ancient modes of slavery and the codes of dueling were abolished; that it is an outmoded survival of barbarism and superstition; and that the chain of evil which holds us to it, with all its new and vicious terrors, can and must be broken where we are.

With this in view we would again solemnly resolve and pledge ourselves:

To have no part in any war.

To promote actively and continuously, as the first aim of our nation's foreign policy, the cause of peace and brotherhood, of "peace without victory," and brotherhood without preferment; firmly assured that on such a basis alone can a lasting settlement of the present conflict or of any other be achieved.

To contend against the abiding causes of war in racial injustice, narrow nationalism, imperialistic ambitions, economic exploitation, and inequality of opportunity.

To aid and relieve to the best of our ability the victims of war in all nations alike.

To cultivate as we can a measure of sympathy for, and as far as possible some knowledge and understanding of, all nations and their interests, in the face of a subtle and unscrupulous campaign of propaganda on behalf of any to the exclusion of the others.

And because of our belief that a continuance of hostilities now is certain to render improbable not to say impossible a lasting solution of the questions presently at issue, to promote energetically those forces engaged to bring about an early settlement without "victory," if may be; if not, then after the inevitable exhaustion of all concerned and the nominal success of one party or the other, to give ourselves and urge our nation to give itself as opportunity permits to the promotion of a Christian treaty and to the sacrificial building of a new world-mindedness committed to disarmament of the nations, and to the founding of a community or federation that shall strive to abolish the anarchy from which War comes and hold the common interests of mankind above the selfish interests of nations.

In such an effort to demonstrate their reality and effectiveness, we would engage our intent to make this due and responsible contribution toward the preservation and strengthening of those principles of democracy and freedom which are dear to us all, and which in reality are inseparable from the Christian faith that we of the Church do cherish together.

The *Churchman* (New York) publishes the following from its Toronto, Canada, correspondent:

A belated challenge to Christians was flung out by Brigadier Victor Odlum, recently appointed commander of the second Canadian division, when he said in the course of an interview by the Canadian Press: "When men hate one another they are bound to fight one another. The last war left hatred in men's hearts. The only thing I could see which would remove that hatred was a Christian revival. And there was no Christian revival." This statement is reminiscent of a lively correspondence last September in *The Canadian Churchman* initiated by a group of ten Toronto signatories who urged that whatever happen the self-scourge of hatred be kept out of the picture this time; a bare handful of diehards misunderstood or protested.

An English correspondent of the *Christian Century* writes:

A member of a tribunal, summing up his impression of conscientious objectors, says that his "outstanding conviction as the result of hearing many cases is that of the undoubted honesty and sincerity of the applicants. Only a very few appear to be 'shirkers.'"

The Episcopal Pacifist Fellowship now has a membership of 394, according to a report by Katherine C. Pierce, the secretary, and the work of organization is going forward steadily. Besides the officers and executive committee, there are diocesan representatives in seventeen dioceses—Central New York, Chicago, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Missouri, Newark, New Mexico, New York, Southern Virginia, Tennessee, Texas, Upper South Carolina, Virginia, Vermont, Western Massachusetts and Western New York.

The *Christian Century* correspondent in Edinburgh, Scotland, writes as follows:

One noticeable feature of the public mind in the present war, as compared to the last, is the different attitude toward those who have conscientious objections to taking any part in military service. Legislation has provided that they may be exempted if they furnish good evidence that their scruples are genuine and not merely put forward as an excuse for shirking. Eleven tribunals have been set up to consider applications for exemption. Naturally these tribunals differ in the way they handle cases, but on the whole applicants have been treated with consideration. Many have been granted complete exemption from war service; others have been assigned only civil duties connected with the war; while some who are

obviously insincere are refused exemption altogether. The number of applicants has not been very large—indeed only two percent of those registered for military service. By far the greatest proportion of them object on religious grounds; a few for ethical-philosophical reasons; and a few also, of communist leanings, object to this war for political reasons. A small but appreciable minority of university students have pacifist views and state them freely.

It is only right that in a country which is fighting for the preservation of individual freedom there should be this tolerance of private scruple. Such tolerance on the part of the state is certainly in line with the public mind.

Fellowship, organ of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, publishes the following story from Switzerland:

Pierre Ceresole, of Switzerland, member of the F.O.R. and founder of the International Voluntary Service for Peace, whose work he described at the Northover Conference of the Fellowship in September, 1937, was condemned recently in the Swiss city of Neuchatel to pay a fine of 100 Swiss francs and costs amounting to slightly more than half that sum. His offense consisted of going out into the street during a test blackout, setting up lighted candles, and attempting to give a talk, one part of which comprised a message he had received from Scandinavian pacifists regarding the light of faith and good will that may penetrate the darkness of present civilization.

Also, in *Fellowship,* we find the following note:

From England has come a most interesting letter written by a young pacifist known to a good many Americans; his name is omitted for obvious reasons.

Describing his appeal to the tribunal to change conditions of his exemption, he says: "I went to the tribunal prepared for a wordy duel and an intensive cross-examination. I knew that very few appeals succeeded and I had very little help in securing any alterations in the decision of the local tribunal. Actually, it all proved rather an anti-climax . . . my exemption was changed to stopping in my present employment as railway clerk and continuing with social work." The letter ends with ominous news concerning the mass arrests of young C.O.'s who lost their appeal and refused to report for military duty.

A peace poll recently taken at Radcliffe College produced the following results:

97 per cent of the students voting declared that they did not believe that the United States should enter the war at this time.

46 per cent declared that the United States should not enter the war even though Germany were winning.

63 per cent were opposed to sending supplies to the belligerents.

In her newspaper column, "My Day," Mrs. Roosevelt writes:

Last evening, at our table, there was much talk of old wars and new wars, history already written and history in the writing. When all is said and done, and statesmen discuss the future of the world, the fact remains that the people fight these wars. I wonder that the time does not come, when young men facing each other with intent to kill, do not suddenly think of their homes and their loved ones and, realizing that those on the other side must have the same thoughts, throw away their weapons of mass murder. They might insist that their public servants—the statesmen of the world—get together and on a rational and peaceful basis solve the problems for which wars are fought. Of course, this would take willingness to coöperate, but it should not be impossible to great minds who plan war.

H. Runham Brown, secretary of the War Resisters International in London, England, has sent to the War Resisters League in this country the following letter dated April 19th. It will be noted that reference is made in this letter to George Lansbury as lying ill. It is significant that the letter was received in this country on the day that George Lansbury, President of the War Resisters International, died. Since that date, Holland and Belgium have been destroyed along with Denmark and Norway, but English pacifists are still standing firm. Here is the letter from Mr. Brown:

The WAR RESISTERS LEAGUE
171, West 12th Street
New York City
U. S. A.

Dear Friends,

It is no ordinary message of good cheer and encouragement which I send you today on the occasion of "just another Annual Conference." I write from war-stricken Europe at a time when the issues are in the balance, when no one can foresee what kind of Europe, and perhaps what kind of world, may emerge. It is very hard to be a pacifist in Europe today; we want so much to see liberty and justice established, and the force of oppression overthrown. It is so easy to imagine that all the right is on the side of those who are fighting a defensive war to hold what they have, against an aggressor who is seeking too big a share of the world's wealth. After all, those who hold the wealth do appear also to enjoy a large measure of liberty and justice, both of which are withheld from those who live under dictatorship. Imperialism has brought us to this; brutal itself, it has created greater brutality in the dispossessed as they seek to throw off the yoke.

People say to us, "Where is your pacifism now? Will you answer Hitler with words?" If pacifism was a talisman by rubbing which we could change all the past—would not Mr. Chamberlain resort to it? A quarter of a century or more of wrong doing cannot be put right in a night. Pacifism is a way of life. We have not walked on that road, and we are reaping the whirlwind. Pacifism is not simply refusal to fight,—it is an attitude to all mankind. No little bargain with Hitler will ever be made again. It is the big thing which has to be done. It is difficult for the belligerents to stop the downward race,—the pace has become too fast. There is one great people who must help us.

I am not asking America to come into the war,—but to come into the peace. It is not enough to keep America out of war,—you cannot live in isolation. Come in with great magnanimity and call a halt! If you are big enough in the spiritual sense, you may yet reverse the whole course of events. No little offer of mediation will suffice. You must come in as *vitally* concerned,—not in war,—but to lay the foundation stones of a new world. At first we may flout your efforts,—undaunted you must go on. Put your own house in order while there is time, and as you do so, repeatedly offer to help us put ours in order. Make great tangible efforts, not merely sentiments. Make all the people of the belligerent nations hear you. Let them see the *beginning* of a way out, and you will be surprised at the result. We have tried here in writing "PEACE NOW" to set out a possible way to begin;—go further,—adapt yourself to the new life and begin to build the new world without delay.

Our Chairman, George Lansbury, with his 81 years of labor behind him, lies ill. He writes, "Lying here, rather helpless, my faith grows stronger,—there is no way to peace but our way. You may rely upon me whenever the call to work comes."

Think of little Denmark, bearing less of the guilt than the great nations of the world, having never oppressed as we have oppressed. Denmark lies helpless under the heel of one oppressor,—she has adopted an attitude which is essentially a pacifist one. Force of circumstances may have been the prime motive. The most enlightened little people in the whole of Europe have perhaps been called upon to exhibit a new attitude to violence. Enough of talk about fighting for little nations! War never has and never can save any people. But *you* can save little Denmark,—not from all the suffering that she will have to endure, not by throwing off her yoke by force of arms,—the attempt would destroy her in the doing,—but by saving all Europe and America, too, by starting now on the new way of life.

After the occupation, Hagbard Jonassen got through a letter from Copenhagen in which he writes: "This will, I am afraid, be the last letter from us for a long time. But do not worry about us. We are living peaceful and quiet, and so is the whole country, and we still hope it will go on in the same way. Of course, we cannot work in the usual way but we can and we will keep together and wait for the future in which we hope to see you and all our friends again. We hoped that we could avoid this situation but we are glad that our ideas have been so strong that the government did not use the army. In that way, we escaped a terrible fate."

Will you rise to it?

Yours very sincerely,

H. Runham Brown.